

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 73518

Title: Secondary coronary artery ostial lesions: Three case reports

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06112262 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Chief Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-02 07:52

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-02 16:19

Review time: 8 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous



Baishideng Publishing

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have gone through this interesting and rare case reports of secondary coronary artery ostia lesions. However, the ECG of these three cases are missing, and it would be perfect if the author could make it up.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 73518

Title: Secondary coronary artery ostial lesions: Three case reports

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06144551 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-03 12:47

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-15 16:31

Review time: 12 Days and 3 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https:**//www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors wrote three exciting and rare cases of a Review comment: non-atherosclerotic lesion in the osteal of coronary arteries that presented as acute coronary syndromes. These rare cases can increase the awareness of non-atherosclerotic lesion etiologies in several types of patients, such as an osteal lesion, a patient with underlying comorbidity, possible compression of an aneurysmatic lesion, and congenital anomalies in daily clinical practices. 1. There are some redundant data, especially the imaging studies. It is better to write the whole case one by one, as per guideline, to explain systematically and minimize redundancy. 2. It would be better if the author put the ECGs and chest x-rays, especially the first case with thymic carcinoma. 3. Are there any symptoms and signs of thymic carcinoma in the first case? How did the author decide to do the CTA coroner in the patient? 4. In the second case, one of the possibilities of SVA etiology is Takayasu arteritis. How about this patient? Are there any lesions in the aorta as well? Since the patient also had hypertension, is there any disease in the renal artery? Please also state it as one of the acquired etiologies of SVA in the discussion. How was the regional wall motion of the LV in the echocardiography? 5. In the last patient, please use the drug's generic name (betaloc= metoprolol tartrate). There is a discrepancy of angina type in the discussion section; the authors stated that the chest pain was during exercise, while in the case illustration was unstable angina. Was it a crescendo angina? 6. CTA figure: the lesion will be better visualized if evaluated using window width (WW) and window level (WL) for CT angiography coroner (like figure 3B). The WW is started at 800, and the WL is initiated at 300. Then it can be adjusted for contrast intensity and calcification. It is better to mention the imaging views shown in the figures. 7. Figure 2: osteal of RCA is also better visualized in sagittal view. 8. There



https://www.wjgnet.com

are minor grammatical errors, miss-typed, and an abbreviation at the beginning of a sentence. 9. Secondary coronary artery ostia lesions reported previously are often involved by syphilitic vasculitis, aortic dissection, and other reasons. □the author should put a reference in this sentence.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 73518

Title: Secondary coronary artery ostial lesions: Three case reports

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06144551 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Indonesia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-11-30

Reviewer chosen by: Xin-Ran Guo

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-25 05:51

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-31 01:39

Review time: 5 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have responded to all the comments.